Charles R. Drago
Armstrong, Ellington and Parker
12 Stephen Hopkins Court
Providence, RI 02904

8/19/90

Dear Charlie,

Thanks for your confidence and offer, both of which I appreciate.

Before a perhaps long explanation of what I consider is not irresponsible and my own early interest in a form other than non-fiction, a word about that Inside Edition business. I'd been told the whole thing would be White and me and was indignant when - was cut off in the middle of a response after about 10 minutes. They then cut what they had to what you saw and then dubbed in, instead of what I told the bitch, me sitting and listening to something her hasuband said. I'm surprised at how many people look at that stuff. I've heard from more than from anything else I've done in TV in years.

I'm past 77 now, hot in good health, and while I'm willing to be a technical advisor on your project we don't know what if anything I'll be able to do when you get to the point of wanting technical advice. So I'll send copies to three professors who may be willing to help and have good subject-matter knowledge. Dr. Gerald McKnight, Hood College, Frederick, Md. 21701; Dr. David Wrone, Univ. Wisc., Stevens Point, WI 54481; Dr. Gerald Ginocchio, Wofford College, Spartanburg, S.C. 29303. I've heard very little from Howard Roffman in years. Last I heard he was general counsel for Lucas films but was thinking of a change that would perhaps move him to Los Angeles.

Over the years, in my own thinking and when seeking to help others, I've believed in two tests, is this reasonable and if so, is it possible. I believe this can help avoid irresponsibility on the subject matter in which I consider it wrong and bad.

All my JFK assassination books are essentially rough drafts corrected to a limited degree and except for Post Mortem, written in great haste. To meet a deadline, and this is complicated and I won't go into it, I had four weeks to deliver the first book, Whitewash. I made it. While drooling in the till the publisher cancelled the contract and didn't even return the ms. I had to reconstruct much of it but I believed in what I'd done and I then tried other publishers. I didn't get a single adverse editorial comment but nobody would touch it. So, while driving to and from New York, using a cumbersome reel-to-reel machine I started dictating a novel, in the belief that what I could say in a novel would not be so completely opposed. I soon learned that I am not a novelist. What little I did was terrible. I'm talking about 1965. I tell you this so you'll see that I do not consider an entertainment format per se wrong or irresponsible and have believed that it can permit what might not be accepted as non-fiction.

In the fall of 1966, probably about September, I'd finished Whitewash II, which was not intended to be a book to begin with, and I felt that there was something else I should say. It was after midnight on a Friday night when I went to bed, with this indefinitely on my mind. In a couple of hours I was wide awake, with an idea. I went to the typewriter (then one of the old Underwood uprights so loved by so many reporters of my youth) and started writing. No outline. I just started writing. It was the Epilogue in Whitewash II. Monday morning, I think, after my wife had retyped it, I took the book to the printer. In retrospect I do not criticize what I then believed, for that time and based on what I then had learned or had occasion to think about. But over the years since then I'd come to believe that the cui bono approach cannot be used as I then used it. It can be used now only to eliminate who may have been involved in the JFK (or for that matter the other) assassination(s). There were many too many who could have seen benefit to themselves or their beliefs in that assassination.

I've come to believe that of those who could have seen benefit from the assassination, given what we do know about it, those most likely to have been responsible are those who wanted policy changes.

One such group or force is, by the way, what my novel would have dealt with.

The assassination of any American president has the effect of a coup d'etat because of our system, which makes it inevitable. No vice president is ever a rubber stamp of the president. There will be, inevitably, some policy differences. With JFK become a dove and Johnson always a hawk, those changes were certain to follow JFK's offing. And they did. I can go into detail on some of this if you'd like and I've done the research to back it up. Also a number of spot analyses after Johnson was president. They've stacked.

There are some things that we know that can eliminate some people or forces, particularly involving Oswald. I think my published work alone leave it beyond reasonable question, whether or not he fired a shot (and I still do not believe he did) the crime was beyond the capability of any one man. It thus is a conspiracy. It follows that whether or not he was a patsy, the conspiracy was by those who had full knowledge of his past and present.

This does not mean that the CIA or the FBI, which had this knowledge, did the job and I do not believe that either did. Perhaps self-starters in the CIA, but not the institution. Ditto ONI,

I think that Cuba and the USSR can be eliminated because it is certain that neither preferred LBJ to JFK. Quite the opposite. You may not know it, but JFK and Khruschyev developed quite a lengthy correspondence still kept secret by both sides after the Cuba Missile crisis. And whether or not you know it, the solution to that crisis was JFK's guaranteeing Castro against any invasion, a protection nobody else in the world could give him. Again, I can add more.

But I'm trying to show how cui bono can still be used in planning a screenplay. And not misleading the people.

Becauss it seems apparent that bringing about changes in national policy from those JFK developed - and they were different when he was killed than when he took office - is necessary, to avoid irresponsibility, not to be captive to the accepted cliches of the cold war.

I'm rushing to get this on paper because I want to take a nap (I'm tired and I want to take the Orioles-Red Sox game in tonight and we have company before then) so I hope I'm clear. If not, please ask for clarification.

I'm also trying to address what you refer to as poverty or riches the overload of thousands of pages of research. Perhaps this can help you eliminate some. That should make handling what remains easier. And I don't care whether or not, to use your words, you incorporate my views in what you write. If you want to, OK. If not OK, too.

I'm not trying to influence what you write, only to guide you. When you get to some firmer beliefs about what you will be saying, perhaps I can help you with some documents. You may find one or two in the new material I added to Photographic Whitewash when I reprinted it, perhaps some in the appendix to Post Mortem. In this connection, I do have all but one of the Warren Commission's executive sessions transcripts and I know with certainty what is in that one that is withheld. It was withheld to protect our first unelected President, Jerry Ford, who was viciously racist in it, trying to get Norman Redlich fired. The claim was to protect his privacy. Bull! They gave me what violated it evilly.

As an example of what I mean, although it may not figure in your thinking, there is the official mythology that JFK and Bobby were behind the CIA's childish plot to get the mafia to arrange for Castro's assassination. I have the internal CIA record that shows this was not the case. Only six people knew of it and they were all high CIA officials. In this regard, and again I don't know if it could interest you, Sam Momo Giancana, who was one of those used by the CIA, through Howard Hughes' honcho Bob Maheu, believed that his girl friend, Phyllis McGuire, was lating Dan Martin of the ~~XXXXXXXX~~ Rowan and Martin team. So, he said look, I'm helping you, how about you helping me. So the CIA got an amateurish wiretapped and bugger to bug Martin's room. I have the FBI'd records on this and it can be

made into a very laughable bit. He got off, of course, when he said he would not go down alone. But it gave the FBI a hold on the CIA that in time it used with LBJ. And I have the FBI's highest-level record of that and how it used it with LBJ.

Again, I'm not asking you where you want to go, but if what I have on Yuri Nosenko, the defected KGB, in the last few pages of text in Post Mortem is of interest, I have much more. All that has been disclosed, I think. This includes how the CIA talked the Commission out of taking secret testimony from him. (Aided and abetted by The Unelected in one of the last executive session transcripts I got. He actually intimidated the others into not deciding for itself whether what NOSENKO said was of use or value to it in its work.) The CIA's explanation to the House assassinations committee is as phony as are all its earlier concoctions, of which I remember about three or four. I believe that this testimony, which was televsied from coast to coast, was edited by the CIA before it was published. I have the published testimony and I gave Wrone the tapes I made as aired.

When you have a better idea of what you want to do ask if I have any real records that can be of use to you. What a thing it would be if you could used REAL records in a screenplay or a play for a theater!

As you think about Oswald, do you remember what I have in Oswald In NewOrleans about the former Marine friend who called in when I was on the Joe Dolan show in Oakland? I've been able to prove what he told me about Oswald's security clearances and his personal interests. But the Navy claims to have not a single relevant record. I got the proof from other records. The Commission used dumdums and other dopes to paint the portrait of Oswald that Hoover had sketched out for them and ignored what they could not avoid in the testimony of those not dopey. (Epstein is totally undependable and quite wrong on Oswald, if you are interested. Epstein began on the right extreme and he was coopetd by Angleton, resulting in the reorganization of his book, even the new title, Legend. Epstein's records, by the way, are at Boston College, but I was not able to get access and reportedly they are entirely disorganized.)

Good luck!
Harold